



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,780	02/09/2004	Gregory D. Aviza	00216-674001 / Case 8144	8854
27752	7590	03/24/2008		
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY			EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION - WEST BLDG.			PETERSON, KENNETH E	
WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 412			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
6250 CENTER HILL AVENUE				3724
CINCINNATI, OH 45224				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/24/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/774,780	Applicant(s) AVIZA, GREGORY D.
	Examiner Kenneth E. Peterson	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **14 February 2008**.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) **22,28,38,39,43 and 44** is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) **22,28,38,39,43 and 44** is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 3724

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Francis (4,868,983), who shows a method of making a razor with all of the recited steps including;

Providing a housing (figure 7) having a guard (21),

Providing elongate metal blades (14),

Providing 1st and 2nd end blocks (e.g. figure 4B),

Securing the blades in the end blocks (figure 5) movably in slots (a slot is shown between 8 and 9 in figure 4B),

Inserting the subassembly into the housing (figure 7).

Francis's end blocks are made of brass instead of plastic. Examiner takes Official Notice that that the razor industry has long ago learned to make such parts out of plastic. References to this effect can be provided if challenged. Furthermore, the courts have ruled that it is obvious to select known materials based upon their known effectiveness. In this case, Plastics that can be springy are known, and it is also known that plastics can be cheaper than brass. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified Francis by making his end blocks out of plastic, as argued above, since it would be cheaper.

3. Claims 22,28,38,39,43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Francis (4,868,983), as modified above, and further in view of Santhagens Van Eibergen et al. (6,671,961) and/or Francis (4,516,321) and/or Andrews (6,145,201) and/or Welsh (3,660,893).

In regards to at least claims 38,43 and 44, Francis '893, as modified above, has parts of the knife sticking *slightly* past the end of the blocks, as seen in figure 6 (18 projects past 11). However, Santhagens Van Eibergen (figure 3), Francis '321 (figure 15), Andrews (figure 10) and Welsh (cover figure) show that it is well known for blade subassemblies to not let the blades project past the end blocks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have further modified Francis '983 by having the ends of the blades not project past the end blocks as taught by the above references, since this seems to be the standard in the art, and it also prevents the knife ends from obstructing insertion.

In regards to at least claims 39 and 44, Francis, as modified, lacks a lubricating strip, but this is ubiquitous in the art as seen in Santhagens Van Eibergen (23, lines 18-21, column 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided a lubricating strip for Francis '983, as taught by Santhagans Van Eibergen, in order to provide a more pleasant shaving experience.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3724

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth E. Peterson whose telephone number is 571-272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kenneth E Peterson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724